

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10)**Applicant(s): **Richard A. Skogman**

Docket No.

**15436.435.5**

Application No.

**09/881,167**

Filing Date

**June 14, 2001**

Examiner

**Leith A. Al Nazer**

Customer No.

**022913**

Group Art Unit

**2821**

Invention

**METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PRODUCING VCSELS WITH DIELECTRIC MIRRORS AND  
SELF-ALIGNED GAIN GUIDE****JUN 14 2005****PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE**

I hereby certify that the following correspondence:

Issue Fee Transmittal Letter (1 pg., in duplicate); PTOL-85 Part B Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate); Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance (1 pg.); PTO-2038 Credit Card form in the amount of \$1,703.00 (1 pg.); Certificate of Express Mail Label No. EV 657 809 984 US and postcard

*(Identify type of correspondence)*

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

**June 14, 2005***(Date)***ERIC L. MASCHOFF***(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)**(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)***EV 657 809 984 US***("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)***Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.**



PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No: 15436.435.5

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: )  
 )  
Richard A. Skogman )  
 )  
Serial No: 09/881,167 ) Art Unit  
 ) 2821  
Filed: June 14, 2001 )  
 )  
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PRODUCING )  
VCSELS WITH DIELECTRIC MIRRORS AND SELF- )  
ALIGNED GAIN GUIDE )  
 )  
Examiner: Leith A. Al Nazer )

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communications mailed on March 14, 2005. The Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2005

By:

ERIC L. MASCHOFF  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,596  
Customer No. 022913